

The Library

Fourth Series
Vol. I. No. 2

1 September 1920

THE DANIEL PRESS AT FROME AND OXFORD

By FALCONER MADAN¹

OXFORD is fortunate in possessing, not only a large and important University Press, but also a private press of considerable note. The latter centres in the person of the late Rev. C. H. O. Daniel, Provost of Worcester College from 1903 until his death on 6 September 1919, when he had almost completed his eighty-third year: and its master motive appears to be different from that of any other private presses with which I am acquainted, for it is neither secret propagandism, nor personal pleasure, nor to preserve special literature, nor with the aesthetic aim of improving the art of printing, least of all for monetary gain, but primarily to give pleasure to the Printer's literary friends. Its characteristics may be presented as follows.

It may be doubted if any personal press of note has ever begun so early in the Printer's life, and been maintained for seventy-four years by one person. The Daniel Press began in Trinity Vicarage at Frome in Somerset in 1845, and ended at Oxford in 1919, when a posthumous issue of Sir Nicholas Bacon's *Recreations of his Age* was published. It had four stages: No press, a toy-press, a small hand-press, and a good hand-press. The third stage covers the transference to

¹ An abstract of a paper of which part was read before the *Bibliographical Society* on 19 January 1920, and illustrated with lantern slides.

Oxford in 1874. The issues at Frome may be placed at seven publications and about 440 notices, fly-sheets, texts and the like, and at Oxford sixty of the former and about 210 of the latter. The course of the whole press can therefore be followed, in full detail.

A second point of interest will especially appeal to members of the Bibliographical Society. There are plenty of rarities. How many persons own the *Keble's Easter Day*; the *Garland of Rachel* with the separate eight-page preface; and *Our Memories*, including the fragment of a second series; and the Roman type first Daniel edition of the Poet Laureate's *Growth of Love*?

There is also good literature to be found. Idylls of Theocritus from a unique printed Elizabethan translation, 'A New Sermon of the Newest Sort' of the time of the Civil War, a play by John Webster, purged and re-formed as *Love's Graduate*, delicate pieces from Erasmus, Herrick, Milton, Blake, and Keats, and first editions of pieces by Robert Bridges, F. W. Bourdillon, Sir Herbert Warren, Margaret Woods, 'Rosina Filippi', Laurence Binyon, and others—what can one wish for, more?

Added to these are pleasant marks of distinction which transform the products of mechanical art into personal treasures. Such are the re-discovered, old-fashioned Fell type and ornaments, presented to the University Press by Dr. John Fell in the seventeenth century; the use of good hand-made paper; the printer's Mark, the *cachet* of the Press, a woodcut of Dr. Daniel, represented as in the lion's den, with the legend MISIT ANGELUM SUUM; the miniation of initials (the deft handiwork of Mrs. Daniel), and woodcuts here and there, and personal prefaces. All these complete the contentment of the reader.

The lantern slides which accompanied the dimidiated paper on 25 January illustrated the stages of the Press in some

detail. One exhibited a little booklet of the earliest stage (*References to St. Jude*), which is probably unique among the twelve million products of the world's printing presses. One can imagine a book beginning in writing and ending in print, for writing preceded printing, but what of this book which begins in print and ends, tired out, in manuscript? The *Frome Miniature Gazette*, No. 1, 15 October 1850, was also displayed, printed on one side of a small 8vo sheet. No more was printed, and perhaps it is the shortest of known periodicals. Some publications of the Frome Press were also shown, including the Epistles to the Seven Churches of Asia (from the Revelation), the only separate edition of the Greek text (1857). In some of these Frome pieces, Dr. Daniel's brothers joined him in press-work, and especially the Rev. W. Eustace Daniel, the present Vicar of Horsington in Somerset. Of the Oxford Press there were shown the first use of the Fell type in the *New Sermon* (1877), the *Misit Angelum* mark (1881), a specimen of *Our Memories*, recollections of Oxford by Dean Liddell, Canon Heurtley, Archdeacon Denison, and many others, whom Dr. Daniel beguiled to contribute; and about a dozen other slides.

The actual Press used by Dr. Daniel at Oxford for all his later books has been presented to the Bodleian Library by Mrs. Daniel, and it is in contemplation to print on it a Bibliography of the Daniel Press, with a Memoir of its 'only begotter', and some poems by friends. This will be the first book ever printed within the walls of the Bodleian.



DR. DANIEL'S PRINTER'S MARK

THE OUTPUT OF SPANISH BOOKS IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

By HENRY THOMAS¹

THE present study takes its origin from an official query at the British Museum: 'How many Spanish books printed during the sixteenth century are there in the Museum Library, and what percentage do they form of the total output for that period?' The term 'Spanish books' was intended to include all books printed in Spain in whatever language, and all books in the Spanish language printed abroad; while in this connexion Spain must be understood to coincide with the modern kingdom.

The Spanish Peninsula was very different politically during the sixteenth century from what it is to-day, and some elementary facts concerning its condition about the time we are to consider may well be given as an introduction to our subject. They will help to illuminate, and perhaps to redeem, the statistical account that is to follow.

At the time when printing was introduced into the Spanish Peninsula, six languages were spoken and written there. Of these, Latin stands apart as the official language of the Church, the Law, and the Schools. The other five correspond, very roughly indeed, to five independent political divisions, as follows:

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| Arabic. | The Moorish kingdom of Granada. |
| Basque. | (Part of) the kingdom of Navarre and neighbourhood. |
| Portuguese. | The kingdom of Portugal. |
| Catalan. | (Part of) the kingdom of Aragon. |
| Castilian. | Castile and portions of neighbouring kingdoms. |

¹ Read before the Bibliographical Society, 16 February 1920.

Of the above, Granada and Navarre are minor divisions. Union, for the sake of strength, was desirable, and the political problem of the fifteenth century in the Peninsula was whether and how the three great kingdoms of Castile, Aragon, and Portugal would amalgamate. In 1474, the year during which printing was introduced into the Peninsula, Isabella became Queen of Castile, and the union of Castile and Aragon was foreshadowed, for in 1469 she had married Prince Ferdinand of Aragon. When in 1479 Ferdinand succeeded to the throne of Aragon, Castile and Aragon were united in the person of the Catholic Kings. In 1492 the Moorish kingdom of Granada fell before the combined forces of the two sovereigns. In 1493 the counties of Rousillon and Cerdagne, to the north of the eastern extremity of the Pyrenees, were ceded by France to Aragon,¹ and in 1512 the southern half of the kingdom of Navarre was conquered by Ferdinand. When therefore Charles, the grandson of Ferdinand and Isabella, succeeded to the thrones of Castile and Aragon in 1516, the whole of Spain as we now know it, to the south of the Pyrenees, with an additional trifle on the north-east, came under a single rule. The various elements were united in the person of the Sovereign only—he supplied the central policy right through the century; but there were different and distinct administrations: there were, for instance, separate *Cortes* for Castile, for Aragon, for Catalonia, for Valencia, and for Navarre.

We cannot confine our consideration of Spain to the Peninsula itself. In 1492, the year of the fall of Granada, Columbus discovered the New World. Castile, with its rivers running westwards and its ports facing the Atlantic, expanded on the American continent. Aragon, with its ports on the Mediterranean, had for some time past been expanding eastwards. The Balearic Islands were definitely Aragonese from the

¹ They were not returned till 1659.

middle of the fourteenth century; Sardinia was finally acquired in 1428; and Sicily, already conquered in 1282, was incorporated with Aragon in 1409. Over against Sicily lay the kingdom of Naples, comprising the southern half of Italy. During the latter part of the fifteenth century, this had been under an Aragonese Prince, the bastard son of Alfonso V who had conquered it. After some transferences of ownership about the turn of the century, it was conquered by Ferdinand and annexed to Aragon by 1505. Spain was thus led to contend with France for dominion in Italy. In 1519 Ferdinand's grandson Charles lost his paternal grandfather the Emperor Maximilian; he thereupon succeeded to the Austrian dominions—including the Netherlands—and contended with France for the hegemony of Europe. Charles, now the Emperor Charles V, added the Duchy of Milan to his Italian possessions, investing his son Philip with it in 1540. Sixteen years later (1556) he abdicated, and the Spanish and Austrian dominions were split up. Philip II, Charles's successor in Spain, retained the Mediterranean and Italian possessions, the Franche-Comté, the Netherlands, and the territory acquired in the New World. He forcibly united Portugal to Spain in 1580; but the Northern Provinces of the Netherlands renounced their allegiance to him in 1581. Except for this, the Spanish possessions remained unchanged till about the middle of the seventeenth century—Portugal achieved its independence first in 1640.

Charles V's vast European possessions involved him in enormous undertakings outside Spain. For the greater part of his time he was absent from the Peninsula on various European campaigns. This was not without effect for one aspect of our subject. There could be no settled court, no regular royal residence, and so there was no recognized capital.

The meetings of the Castilian *Cortes* illustrate this clearly. These meetings go back to the year 862. Nearly two hundred

are recorded up to the sixteenth century, and of these only the seventy-third (1309) and twelve others were held in Madrid, the present capital. Madrid, indeed, as a place of importance, is comparatively modern; it had not established itself at the beginning of the period we are to consider. This too may be illustrated from the meetings of the Castilian *Cortes* held during the period 1500-58; the reason for the latter date will appear in a moment. Twenty-six meetings were held during the period in question, some extending to more than one place. Both the choice of cities, and the number of meetings held in each, are instructive. Ten were held at Valladolid, five at Madrid, four at Burgos, three at Toledo, while La Coruña, Salamanca, Santiago de Compostela, Segovia, Seville, and Toro figure once in the list. There was a great change from this numerous and scattered assortment in the latter part of the century, 1559-1600, which almost coincides with the reign of Philip II. During the years 1548-59 Philip had been away from Spain a great deal, Queen Mary of England claiming his attention for some portion of the time. He returned in 1559, from which year his personal government dates, and in 1560 he established Madrid as the *única corte*, the sole capital, and so it has remained ever since, except for the brief period when the court was transferred to Valladolid at the beginning of the seventeenth century. Hence it comes about that of the thirteen *Cortes* held between 1559 and 1600, eleven were held at Madrid, one at Toledo, and one at Córdoba. For rather more than the first half of the century, therefore, Valladolid was preferred for such events as would usually take place in a capital—a meeting of Parliament or an *auto de fe*; during the remaining years Madrid was the official choice.

As a parallel but minor point it may be mentioned that the *Cortes* of Navarre usually met at Pamplona, Estella, or Tudela,

the Aragonese *Cortes* at Saragossa, Monzón, or Tarazona, the Catalanian at Barcelona, Monzón, or Lérida, and the Valencian at Valencia or Monzón. Monzón, now a small town of some 4,000 inhabitants, was favoured because of its central position; it is now of little importance, and the parliament-house has become a *juego de pelota*—a fives-court.

This non-existence of an official capital for more than half of the sixteenth century must be borne in mind when considering early Spanish printing. It explains the lateness of the introduction of printing into Madrid, and the absence of any city with a preponderating output, corresponding to London for England, and Paris for France. It helps to explain the sudden spurts that are to be observed in the output of certain places. Official documents—laws and ordinances—had a habit of being printed where they were passed or sanctioned, and official documents loom large in the output of the sixteenth century in Spain, forming, for instance, thirteen to fourteen per cent. of the specimens of sixteenth-century Spanish printing now in the British Museum. The common practice of assigning those printed in the first half of the sixteenth century to a Madrid press is to be deprecated.

Besides the political character of the Peninsula, its geographical conditions must be borne in mind when dealing with Spanish printing. Its average altitude is the second highest in Europe. The central portion consists of high tablelands cut off from each other by lofty mountain-ridges, and deeply carved by large but generally unnavigable rivers. Communication by road between the different districts was, and in many cases still is, bad. We shall therefore not expect to find the art of printing spread in Spain along the rivers and the trade-routes, as it did in and from Germany. We shall rather expect to find it establishing itself in the principal cities of well-defined districts. And for geographical as well

as for political reasons, we shall not expect to find any city with a preponderating output.

The regional character of Spain has always exercised a considerable influence on the life of the country: the influence is very marked in modern Spanish fiction. It has led to intense local patriotisms, and these have been usefully employed in the field of bibliography. The Spaniards have been enthusiastic bibliographers since the days of Antonio. Besides the well-known general bibliographies which exist, from 1887 onwards a number of local bibliographies have been published, giving the productions of the printing press in different places; without these the present study would have been impossible. The list, arranged in chronological order, is as follows:

- | | | |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1887. | Toledo . . . | C. Pérez Pastor. |
| 1889. | Alcalá de Henares ¹ . | J. Catalina García. |
| 1891, &c. | Madrid . . . | C. Pérez Pastor |
| 1894. | Seville . . . | F. Escudero y Perosso. |
| 1895. | Medina del Campo | C. Pérez Pastor. |
| 1900. | Córdoba . . . | J. M. de Valdenebro y Cisneros. |
| 1902. | León . . . | C. Bravo Guarida. |
| 1912. | Lérida. . . . | M. Jiménez Catalán. |
| 1913-14. | Aragon (Saragossa, Huesca, Épila) | J. M. Sánchez. |
| 1916. | Tarragona . . . | A. del Arco. |

It will be observed that there are no bibliographies for five important cities: Barcelona, Burgos, Salamanca, Valencia, and Valladolid; though Valencia is partly provided for by the dictionary of Valencian presses of J. E. Serrano y Morales (1898-9) and the *Bibliografía Valenciana (Catàlech descriptiu de les obres impreses en llengua valenciana)* of E. Genovés y Olmos (1911). For books printed outside the Peninsula,

¹ To be supplemented by the *Impresos de Alcalá en la Biblioteca del Escorial* of B. Fernández (1916).

there is a bibliography for Sardinia by E. Toda y Güell (1890) and a general work, *Bibliographie hispanique extra-péninsulaire* by H. Vaganay in vol. xlii of the *Revue Hispanique* (1918).

With this preparation we may turn to our real subject of early Spanish book-production. A few figures may be given for the first quarter of a century, during which printing was practised in Spain, for comparison later with the sixteenth-century statistics. These figures are easily obtained, now that Dr. Haebler has published the second part of his *Bibliografía Ibérica del siglo xv* (1917), with complete summaries at the end. Dr. Haebler records printing at thirty places in Spain, as against twenty-four recorded by Proctor in his *Index to Early Printed Books in the British Museum* (1898-1903). Two of Dr. Haebler's extra places are treated by Proctor as foreign towns and classified under other countries, Perpignan, with two books, and Cagliari with one book; two towns, Jerez and Segorbe, with one book each, are doubtfully included; the other two, Montalbán and Santiago de Compostela, have two books each. The total for these extra places does not run into double figures.

Dr. Haebler records a total output of 800 books for thirty Spanish places in the fifteenth century. Of these, the British Museum has 155 (perhaps 157) for sixteen places, that is, nearly 20 per cent., a very creditable proportion. The distribution of these books among the most important places is the only other set of statistics for the fifteenth century which we need consider here. The places run mostly in pairs. Two important Castilian cities, Seville and Salamanca, produced respectively 140 and 130 books; two Aragonese cities, Barcelona and Saragossa, 97 and 94, while the Aragonese Valencia just beats the Castilian Burgos with 78 against 77. Toledo stands by itself with 39 to its credit. The Castilian Valladolid has 23, against 20 of the Aragonese Lérida. Montserrat (Aragon) has 17, Zamora (Castile) 16, and Pamplona

(Navarre) 16. Nearly all these twelve places will concern us in the sixteenth century. If to these are added Tarragona, with 8 books, and Granada with 2, the rest can be ignored.

We can now pass on to the books produced during the sixteenth century. From the bibliographies mentioned above we can obtain figures representing the output of books in a number of important places. With the aid of figures for the British Museum collection we can infer roughly the output of other places for which no bibliographies exist. It is not pretended that in either case the figures are exact. The bibliographies are more or less complete according to the ability and opportunities of the compiler, and the date at which they were compiled. The British Museum figures given below are not final. The Museum collection includes some two or three hundred unsigned books or pamphlets. Of these some eighty have not yet been assigned to any place of printing, while those already assigned will require a certain amount of redistributing as information accumulates.

The figures not being exact in either case, the inferences are only approximate; but the processes by which they are obtained can be controlled, and the defects of the methods employed will be pointed out to help to this end.

We may now consider the output of the individual cities and towns where printing was carried on during the sixteenth century in Spain. The figures given above for the fifteenth century suggest an interesting speculation as to which place can claim the highest output for the succeeding century. I may illustrate this by giving the guesses I made when I first considered the question, without any detailed information to guide me. For reasons already stated, I did not expect to find any one place with a vastly preponderating output. I ruled out the Aragonese cities, and looked to the predominant partner Castile for the most productive places; and in Castile I passed over Madrid, since I knew

that printing was only established there in 1566, six years after it became the *única corte*—it took some time for Madrid to absorb the court and its parasites and to settle down to business. I had the fifteenth-century figures—for what they were worth—showing that Seville and Salamanca were the chief producers of books down to 1500. I knew that Seville acquired enormous wealth from its association with the New World, and I had met the Seville imprint very frequently in the important popular literary works of our period. I knew that Ferdinand and Isabella revived the ancient University of Salamanca, and restored it to something approaching its former high position in the world of learning. And I knew that Cardinal Jiménez de Cisneros founded a great University at Alcalá de Henares, which understood its duty to foster learning through the printing press better than most of our modern English Universities. But the University of Alcalá de Henares was not founded till 1508, and its influence was only felt in printing from the beginning of the next decade onwards. These considerations led me to think that the three cities just named would make all the running, and that they would finish in the following order: 1, Seville; 2, Salamanca; 3, Alcalá de Henares. I was quite wrong. Let me prove it by giving the facts, based on the bibliographies and the British Museum figures. The bibliographies cover five important Castilian cities. These cities, with the date of publication of the bibliography, the total books produced, according to the bibliography, the number of books in the British Museum, and the percentage these form of the given total, are entered in the following table:

	<i>Total.</i>	<i>B.M.</i>	<i>Percentage.</i>
Madrid (1891)	777	240	30+
Alcalá (1889)	758	233	30+
Seville (1894).	750	253	33+
Toledo (1887)	419	127	30+
Medina (1895)	248	76	30+

Before proceeding to make use of the above table, I should call attention to a slight defect. The percentage given in the fourth column represents the ratio of the British Museum figures to those of the bibliographies. But some of the books in the British Museum collection are not mentioned in the bibliographies. These should go to increase the numbers in the second column. But in no case will they be sufficient, I believe, to reduce the percentage by a single point, and so, after this brief mention, they may be neglected.

It will be observed that all the bibliographies concerned above are not less than a quarter of a century old. The Seville bibliography is probably the least satisfactory, the least complete; hence, to some extent, the high Museum percentage in this case. The Museum figures support the order of my forecast as between Seville and Alcalá. I was surprised to find Madrid take the first place, in view of its late start; but I am inclined to think that if the Madrid and the Seville bibliographies were brought up to date, the relative positions of the two cities would be reversed, and Seville would rank as the chief producing centre of the sixteenth, as well as of the fifteenth century. It is probable that more books would accrue to Seville during the obscurer first half of the century than would accrue to Madrid during the better known second half.

Admitting that the figures for Seville are abnormal, the British Museum has a rough average of 30 per cent. of the recorded output for the three first rank and the two second rank cities mentioned above. In view of the constancy of this proportion, we may assume that it holds good for the three other important Castilian cities, one of the first rank and two of the second rank, for which no bibliographies exist. We can therefore construct the following table with the aid of the Museum figures :

	<i>Estimated Total.</i>	<i>B.M.</i>	<i>Percentage.</i>
Salamanca . . .	[753]	226	30
Valladolid . . .	[366]	110	30
Burgos . . .	[273]	82	30

The figures in the second column perhaps flatter these three cities, for in their case the percentage is reckoned as exactly 30, whereas in the case of the five cities previously mentioned the percentage was nearly a point higher than the figure actually given. On a full 31 per cent. basis the figures for Salamanca would be reduced to 730. On the other hand, it must be borne in mind that the British Museum figures, on which these estimates are based, are probably less favourable to Salamanca than to Seville, Madrid, or Alcalá. Salamanca was a great theological University; much religious literature was printed in the city, and religious literature has not been greatly sought after in the past, except by those specially interested. The figures given later for the chief Aragonese city, which has quite a modern bibliography, show that if up-to-date figures were available for Madrid, Alcalá, Seville, and Salamanca, these cities would be credited with a much larger output; the race for primacy would be a close one, and in the finish the order here allotted to them might be changed.

In the case of the less important Castilian cities, the Museum is hardly likely to have so high a percentage of books, for the minor presses tend to produce books of local interest, or books which do not find their way so easily into the main stream of commerce. We may assume that the percentage held by the Museum decreases as the importance of the city diminishes. With the Museum figures for three cities of the third rank as printing centres, I make the following estimate :

	<i>Estimated Total.</i>	<i>B.M.</i>	<i>Percentage.</i>
Granada . . .	[120]	30	25
Logroño . . .	[75]	15	20
Pamplona . . .	[55]	11	20

These percentages and totals are supported by the figures for a fourth city, which has a fairly recent bibliography :

	<i>Total.</i>	<i>B.M.</i>	<i>Percentage.</i>
Córdoba (1900) . . .	51	10	20

All the other Castilian cities and towns in which printing was carried on during the sixteenth century—some forty in number—fail to reach double figures in the Museum collection. Here the Museum may be assumed to possess not more than 10 per cent. of the total output¹; it has fifty books in all, and so we may make the following conjecture for the whole group :

	<i>Estimated Total.</i>	<i>B.M.</i>	<i>Percentage.</i>
Other places . . .	[500]	50	10

This gives a grand total for Castile of over 5,000 books, of which the British Museum possesses between 1,400 and 1,500, giving an excellent average of 28 per cent. As has been explained, however, the percentage would be slightly reduced by adding to the grand total the number of books in the British Museum which are not recorded in the bibliographies. It would be appreciably reduced if the number of books which modern research has revealed, or could easily reveal, were also added; for the Museum figures can only be increased by the tardy processes of purchase and presentation.

The Aragonese books have purposely been left for separate consideration. The reason is that the existing bibliographies relating to Aragon are quite modern, and much more complete than those relating to Castile; and partly—but only partly—on this account the British Museum does not maintain the same average for Aragonese books as for Castilian. The whole of the figures for Aragon are on a different plane from those for Castile.

Three bibliographies mentioned above give the sixteenth-

¹ It has none of the eight books which, according to a bibliography of 1902, were printed in León during the sixteenth century.

century output for five Aragonese cities widely differing in importance :

	<i>Total.</i>	<i>B.M.</i>	<i>Percentage.</i>
Saragossa (1913-14) . .	870	107	12+
Tarragona (1916) . .	40	8	20
Lérida (1912) . .	28	4	14+
Huesca (1914) . .	32	1	3+
Épila (1914) . .	3	1	33+

The total for Saragossa exceeds by nearly a hundred the total for the premier Castilian city : this is explained by the dates at which the respective bibliographies were compiled. The Museum percentages for these five cities are very erratic. Those for Huesca and Épila may be ignored, for the purpose of deduction, as being freakish. The percentage for Tarragona has suddenly jumped from 15 to 20 through the recent acquisition of two books printed there. The lower average for Aragonese books, as compared with Castilian, is due to several causes : the newness of the Aragonese bibliographies ; the fact that, with but one or two exceptions, all the Museum books printed in the above five cities are included in the bibliographies ; and—the most influential cause of all—the fact that Aragonese books, being often of local interest or in the Catalan language, have not had the same interest for English collectors as the Castilian books.

The erratic nature of the Museum percentages in the case of the Aragonese cities for which there is a bibliography, makes it difficult to estimate the output of the two remaining cities, Barcelona and Valencia, for which there is no bibliography of the kind required. It would be a little rash to assume that the Museum possesses so small a proportion of the Valencian books as 12 per cent., for its holding of 120 books would then imply a total output of 1,000 for this city. Yet this total may be approximately correct, for Valencia produced, according to the bibliography mentioned above, 132 books in Catalan alone, and it was a wealthy city in the

sixteenth century. On the other hand, it was also an important literary centre; consequently, its books are usually of more general appeal than those produced in Saragossa, and it seems likely that the Museum would acquire a higher proportion of the former than of the latter. But it would be equally rash to assume that the Museum possesses a higher proportion than 14 per cent. of the Valencian books, in view of the above table, and I have taken this figure as a reasonable estimate for Valencia and Barcelona. This gives us the following table:

	<i>Estimated Total.</i>	<i>B.M.</i>	<i>Percentage.</i>
Valencia . . .	[857]	120	14
Barcelona . . .	[693]	97	14

The resulting order of the three principal cities in the kingdom is confirmed by the fact that 37 presses are recorded as having been at work in Saragossa during the sixteenth century, against 36 in Valencia and 31 in Barcelona.

The above tables give an estimated total of a trifle over 2,500 Aragonese books, of which the British Museum possesses 338, or a little more than 13 per cent.—less than half its proportion of Castilian books. The combined total of Castilian and Aragonese books amounts, according to the present estimates, to over 7,500; but as all the important Castilian bibliographies were compiled a quarter of a century or more ago, it is probable that 10,000 more nearly represents the actual output of books printed in Spain itself during the sixteenth century. One small test may be applied to these figures. Just before the war there was published a list, by the late Konrad Burger, of the books printed in Spain and Portugal during the period 1501-36.¹ Burger's list is far from complete, but I calculate roughly that he has recorded about 1,700 books for Spain alone; that is, for a little more

¹ *Die Drucker und Verleger in Spanien und Portugal von 1501-1536.* Leipzig 1913.

than the first third of the century, rather less than a quarter of my estimated total for the whole century, before my addition for the books that are lost or unrecorded by the bibliographers. The proportion is about what one would expect.

My estimate does not yet account for all the Spanish books printed in the Peninsula during the sixteenth century. As was mentioned above, from 1580-1640 Portugal formed part of Spain. Both before, during, and after this period Spanish books were printed in various Portuguese cities; and as, in the sixteenth century, these books were usually of some importance from the literary or historical point of view, we may assume that a very fair proportion found their way into the British Museum. Three cities only are concerned, and I reckon the Museum percentage at 25 for the chief city, and at 20 for the other two. If these figures are too optimistic, the estimated totals will have to be increased in the following table :

	<i>Estimated Total.</i>	<i>B.M.</i>	<i>Percentage.</i>
Lisbon	[128]	32	25
Coimbra	[45]	9	20
Evora	[20]	4	20

This gives a rough estimated total of 200 Spanish books printed in Portugal during the sixteenth century.

Along with the productions of the Peninsula itself may be classed the few books produced, in Castilian or in the local vernacular, in the outlying islands—the Balearic Islands and Sardinia—during the century. For Sardinia, Sr. Toda records some 30 such books, of which the British Museum has but one. The Museum has two such books printed in Majorca. Assuming something like the same proportion to hold good here, we may add roughly a hundred books for the outlying islands. Estimates are hazardous where such small figures are concerned, but 300 books for Portugal and the islands—however they are to be distributed—should suffice as an addition for what I may call the home district.

But there are other and more considerable additions to be made before we can obtain an estimate of the full total of Spanish books printed during the sixteenth century. For these additions my introductory historical remarks will have prepared the reader. If the question arises, 'What country had the most books printed abroad in its language or languages during the sixteenth century?' the answer is not far to seek. Spain was the great imperialistic power in the sixteenth century, and the Spanish books printed abroad during that century far outnumber those printed in any other language in a foreign country. I propose to pass over, with a mere mention, the Spanish books printed in the New World. Books printed abroad derive their chief interest, typographically speaking, from the fact that they are produced in a country where the main printed literature is in the native vernacular, when not in Latin; and in the Spanish colonies in America the language of the aborigines did not count for the purposes of the printing press. It would also be unfair to separate the Spanish books from the Latin books printed in these colonies. The whole subject of early printing in America should be dealt with by itself. It has been well studied, and the results are readily available. I can pass on to consider the Spanish books printed outside the Peninsula in European countries having a flourishing press of their own.

Most of the western countries of Europe are involved, three of them to a considerable extent. There is little published information which will enable us to form an estimate of the number of Spanish books printed in these countries. As was mentioned above, H. Vaganay produced in 1918 a bibliography of works by Spaniards printed abroad in any language—more are in Latin than in Spanish; but since in the case of the Spanish books his figures are generally exceeded by the British Museum figures, I can as a rule confine my attention to the latter.

The Spanish connexion with Italy, briefly indicated above, accounts for the fact that Spanish books were printed in various Italian cities, some within and some without the Spanish dominions, for the benefit of resident Spaniards and of natives anxious to read or learn the language.

The following table shows the numbers possessed by the Museum for the different cities, together with the numbers recorded by Vaganay. It must not be assumed that the higher total for any of these cities represents the known output, for the Museum possesses books not recorded by Vaganay, who in his turn records books which are not in the Museum. Further, the table ignores one or two cases of fictitious imprints.

	B.M.	Vaganay.		B.M.	Vaganay.
Venice . .	40	36	Turin . .	3	—
Rome . .	20	8	Florence . .	2	—
Milan . .	9	6	Bergamo . .	1	—
Ferrara . .	4	2	Bologna . .	—	1
Naples . .	3	2	Mantua . .	—	1

The Museum therefore has 82 Spanish books printed in Italy—as against 56 recorded by Vaganay. Early Italian books are well represented in the British Museum, for reasons well understood by those acquainted with the history of the institution during the nineteenth century. It is reasonable to suppose that Spanish books printed in Italy are also well represented. They are usually books of some literary or historical value, and are therefore all the more likely to have come to the notice of collectors, especially the collectors interested in Italy and the Museum during the last century. We may assume that the Museum has at least as high a proportion of these books as it has of Castilian books—say rather over 30 per cent. This would mean an estimated total of some 250 Spanish books printed in Italy.

The most important contribution to the foreign section of our subject comes from the Netherlands. Spanish books

began to be printed in the Netherlands not long after Charles V inherited this portion of the Austrian dominions. The sixteenth-century output is spread over five cities, but nearly all the books were printed in Antwerp, which, as a producer of Spanish books in this century, ranks with the Castilian cities of the second class. If we assume that the same proportion between the British Museum figures and the total output holds good for Antwerp as for the Castilian cities, then Antwerp ranks an easy first among these cities of the second class. The following table, giving the Museum totals and the numbers recorded by Vaganay, suggest however that the proportion is likely to be higher in the present case.

	<i>B.M.</i>	<i>Vaganay.</i>
Antwerp	167	105
Brussels	13	5
Louvain	5	—
Leyden	3	—
Liège	2	—

This gives a total of 190 Spanish books printed in the Low Countries during the sixteenth century now in the British Museum, as against 110 recorded by Vaganay. A considerable amount of evidence could be adduced to show that the Netherlands were the chief source of supply of Spanish books for the English market at this time. This is only natural in view of the proximity of the two countries, the ease with which books could be transported by water from Antwerp to London, and the common cause which England and the Netherlands made against Spain late in the century. I incline to think therefore that a considerable proportion of the Spanish books printed in the Netherlands reached England, and that of these again a high percentage is represented in the British Museum. It will certainly not lead to any exaggeration of the total output if we assume that the Museum possesses nearer 40 per cent. than 30 per cent. of the Spanish books printed in Antwerp, and we may estimate the total for

Antwerp alone at about 450 books, and for the whole of the Netherlands at about 500 books.

The only other European country which produced Spanish books in any quantity during the sixteenth century was France. Only four cities are involved—Lyons, Paris, Perpignan, and Toulouse—and the reasons why they figure in the list are not far to seek. Paris established a Spanish connexion through its famous *Horæ* in the early part of the century. Lyonese printers, wood-cutters, and artists, and their wares, readily found their way to Spain down the Rhone. Toulouse was no great distance beyond the frontier, and Perpignan, as already stated, was at this time within the Spanish border. The British Museum figures for these cities, with the corresponding figures from Vaganay, are as follows :

	B.M.	Vaganay.
Lyons	24	22
Paris	9	18
Perpignan	3	—
Toulouse	3	—

That is, a total of 39 books for the British Museum, as against Vaganay's 40. We may assume that these figures represent a high percentage of the total number of Spanish books printed in France, and we may estimate this total at roughly 100 books.

The remaining European countries may be dismissed briefly. The British Museum possesses ten books, wholly or partly in the Spanish language, published in England during the sixteenth century. All of them were printed in London except one, which has a Paris imprint, but which was produced at the newly-revived Oxford press in 1586. The Museum also possesses six Spanish books in which a German city figures in the imprint: Augsburg three times, Frankfurt twice, and Cologne once. Vaganay mentions one printed at Strasburg, which makes a total of seven for Germany. The Museum has two Spanish books printed at Basle, and two or three religious books with a Venetian imprint which are attributed

to Geneva. Vaganay mentions a book printed at Prague, and the Museum has one printed at Salonica. We may roughly estimate the total for these minor countries at 50, and the full total of sixteenth-century Spanish books printed outside the Peninsula—ignoring the New World—at 900, or about 9 per cent. of those estimated to have been produced in the home district.

This completes the answer to the query originally put to me, and I may celebrate the termination of these unwonted arithmetical exercises by saying a few words about the physical side of the books themselves.

Printing was introduced into Spain from Italy, and the earliest books printed in the Peninsula were in Roman type. One would have expected the Roman type to have held its own; but it yielded before the Gothic type that the Spaniards welcomed from the German printers who brought the new art and spread it in their country. The typical Spanish book at the beginning of the sixteenth century is a small folio or quarto, printed in heavy regular Gothic type, with correspondingly heavy ornamental initials of uniform character, and heavy woodcuts to match: a favourite form of decoration throughout the century was the national coat of arms.

If we once accept the native convention, the Spanish master-printers and their men of, roughly speaking, the first quarter of the sixteenth century produced books equal to the best turned out elsewhere. After the first quarter of the century the quality of the books begins to deteriorate, more quickly in some places than in others; the decline is noticeably rapid in Barcelona and Valencia. It is easy to understand this deterioration. The standard was well maintained where the firm of one of the old masters, especially where the master himself, was long-lived; for instance, the firm of G. Coci in Saragossa, the Cromberger firm in Seville, the Junta firm in Burgos and Salamanca, A. Guillen de Brocar in Alcalá and

elsewhere. But increased output and increased competition started printing early on its downward career, in Spain as in other countries. In Spain the decadence was general after 1530. Once a 'rot', the result of a decline in taste, affects an art or craft, that art or craft goes steadily down until it finds a certain economic level, from which competition again can but slowly raise it through individual efforts to restore taste.

Several causes combined to bring about the deterioration in the art of printing in Spain. Chief among them, of course, was the impoverishment of the country through the Sovereign's ambitious foreign policy. But the decline set in long before this could have any very appreciable effect, as a result of more intrinsic and consequently more general causes. Increased output followed an increased demand for books. The sources of paper-supply tended to become exhausted, and inferior paper had perforce to be used. Increased production also involved the absorption into the craft of greater numbers of workmen, who had neither the training, nor the tradition, nor the opportunity of acquiring the purer taste of their predecessors. With the extension of a printer's business, his stock of types increased and became very diversified. More especially his ornamental initials and woodcuts accumulated, till he found himself in possession of a large and motley assortment—both as to size and treatment—upon which he drew without discrimination. As a result, the old uniformity—the suitable blending of type, initials, and decorations—disappeared; and this process was accentuated as Italian influences reappeared towards the middle of the century. An ill-assorted assembly of types, initials, and perhaps also woodcuts, becomes characteristic of books of any length, and this could not help but diminish the taste of all connected with the craft. The workman found less and less inducement to turn out artistic work, owing to the nature of his materials,

and he allowed his press-work to deteriorate. Spanish press-work of the declining period, which begins well before the impoverishment of the country, is at least as bad as that of any other country, including our own.

Besides this deterioration in book-production, which was general throughout Europe, there are stages of evolution of more local interest to which attention may now be directed. As was mentioned above, Spanish books at the beginning of the sixteenth century were in folio or quarto, and for the most part in Gothic letter. Smaller books—octavo and lesser sizes—first appear at the beginning of the third decade, as far as my observation goes. These smaller sizes are not very numerous till towards the middle of the century, for they were based on Italian, French, and Netherlands models, and Italian influences only became prominent in Spanish book-production after they had produced a decisive effect in Spanish literature, that is, early in the fourth decade. It was towards the middle of the century too that Spanish books began to be produced in considerable quantities at Antwerp, mostly in very handy sizes, and these editions were soon copied in Spain.

The influence of the Italian and Netherlands books helped to bring about another change. Spanish books printed in Italy during the sixteenth century were either in Gothic letter, after the Spanish model, or else in Roman or Italic type, like the native books; those printed in the Netherlands were in Roman or Italic type only. For two-thirds of the century Gothic type was the standard type for popular books, and indeed for most books, in Spain itself—the words *Letra gótica* or *Letra de Tortis* occur with wearisome regularity in Spanish bibliographies for this period. In the University cities, especially Alcalá and Salamanca, other types were used: Roman type was more common, because a number of the books printed there were intended for students and scholars, and were in the traditional type for scholarly books;

Italic type was also fairly frequently used, not often by itself, but usually as a commentary type where a work consisted of text and gloss. Italic type—*letra bastardilla*—never obtained a popular hold on Spain. The native taste in types can perhaps best be illustrated by brief data relating to Seville, for Seville was the chief centre for the production of popular literature, at least till Madrid became the capital. Italic type is rarely met with in Seville books. Ignoring an Italian book with a Seville imprint, dated 1540, which I imagine was printed in Italy, the first example of a complete book in Italic type printed in Seville is dated 1544. Throughout the century Seville books printed in Italics do not seem to reach double figures. Roman type is, of course, more important. Before 1550 I only know of some half-dozen books printed in Roman type—or in mixed Roman and Gothic—in Seville, and these are mostly reprints of scholarly books first produced elsewhere. Another half-dozen books in Roman type appeared between 1550 and 1556, after which there is a pause for a time. In 1567 the flow begins again, and from 1570 onwards most Seville books were printed in Roman type: Gothic type was only used when some favourite popular book was reprinted in imitation of existing models. The date 1567 is significant. This is the year after a printing-press, using Roman types, was established in Madrid. Now that it was the capital, Madrid at once set the fashion for other cities, at the same time filching from them much of their book-trade.

The last remark is a reminder that many small points of interest arise in the study of book-production in the mass over a whole century, even though that study is confined to the typographical side, and does not concern itself with literary contents, which of course would bring us into contact with most phases of the life of the time. In addition to noting the changes already mentioned—those of size and type—we may observe with regret the passing of famous masters

of the craft, and the dissolution of old-established firms. On the other hand, we may see new presses replacing those that have disappeared, or introducing the art of printing into new centres. Alcalá and Madrid are especially interesting in this respect, for we can watch them stealing the trade that formerly went to other cities. We may wonder why presses started at all in some places of little importance, and why they started so late in other places now of considerable importance, such as Córdoba (1566), Bilbao (1578), Cádiz (1595), and Málaga (1599). We may attempt to explain to ourselves the sudden increase of output which certain places achieve in certain years: we may note the effect of a meeting of the *Cortes*, of a local lawsuit, or of a national controversy like that raised by Bartolomé de las Casas concerning the cruelties to the Indians, which kept the Seville presses busy in 1552; or we may trace the influence of a prominent cleric or scholar, like Cardinal Jiménez and Antonio de Nebrija at Alcalá early in the century, or Archbishop Antonio Agustín at Tarragona late in the century. We may attempt to account for the sudden decrease or cessation of output in certain places, usually as the result of plague or civil war. A good instance of the latter is Medina del Campo. During the rising of the *Comuneros* (1520), the better part of the city was burned to the ground. The recently published *Historia de Carlos Quinto*, by Pedro Mexía, gives some details of the occurrence.¹ Cloth and gold and silver of enormous value, we are told, were lost in the fire—and a few women and children too. A number of notable citizens were killed by the local labour-leader, among them a bookseller whose name is unfortunately not mentioned. It is natural to find a gap and much uncertainty in the book-trade at Medina del Campo about this time. Printers fought shy of the place, which became a mart rather than a producing centre: it is

¹ *Revue Hispanique*, 1918, tom. xliv, p. 152.

remarkable for its booksellers who had books printed in any city but their own, contrary to the usual practice.

But to develop such points is beyond the scope of this inquiry; the reader who, under the influence of its title, has steeled himself to endure dull statistics, may well complain that he should not now be compelled to consider interesting sidelights. With this healthy reminder of its nature and purpose, the present paper may conveniently be brought to a close.

In the discussion which followed Dr. Thomas's paper Mr. Lyell expressed his indebtedness to Dr. Thomas for the light he had shed on what was without doubt an obscure branch of bibliography, as far as this country was concerned. He thought two practical considerations emerged from the paper: (a) The extent of the present available information regarding early Spanish books; (b) How that information could usefully be extended. As far as the information in this country was concerned, the bibliographical material in our own language was negligible, and if we looked abroad, the position was not very much better, as with the exception of bibliographies dealing with certain towns, the general Spanish bibliographies, such as Salvá and Gallardo, were out of date. He urged the importance of preparing a comprehensive work for early Spanish books on the lines of Proctor's Index for Germany 1501-20, but for the whole of the sixteenth century, and suggested it might usefully contain an introduction on the lines of Fumagalli's *Lexicon Typographicum Italiae*. After discussing the excellence of the early Spanish types and press-work, and the remarkable beauty of the decoration employed, giving illustrations from books produced in the first quarter of the century, Mr. Lyell concluded by asking Dr. Thomas to mention any notable English collectors of Spanish books.

Mr. Gaselee said that, in reply to Mr. Lyell, he could give

the name of at least one English collector who had brought together a good number of Spanish books; this was Samuel Pepys, who four or five times in his Diary tells how he visited second-hand booksellers, in Duck Lane and elsewhere, to look over their stocks of Spanish books with a view to purchase. The majority however, of those acquired by him were of the seventeenth and not of the sixteenth century. He specialized very largely in Ballads, Romances, and little plays, sacred and profane, of about the years 1660-95.

The Spanish sixteenth-century books in the Pepysian Library are perhaps only half a dozen in number, three of them printed in Spain, one in Venice, and two in the Low Countries. If so small a number of such books reached the library of a careful collector like Pepys, it would appear probable that those in English libraries generally, are a very small proportion of the whole output, and the figures given by Dr. Thomas would not err on the generous side.

A similar conclusion might be drawn from estimates based on the excellent *Bibliography of Spanish Sixteenth-Century Books* by Dr. Burger. From a single sale catalogue, that of the Fairfax Murray Sale, he had been able to add no less than five or six books,¹ not recorded by Dr. Burger. In this case also, therefore it seems that the existing lists can be multiplied a good deal to arrive at the true output.

Finally, he suggested that as an explanation of the excellence of the type and press-work of the Spanish books of the early years of the sixteenth century that printing entered Spain late, and owing to the difficulties of communication spread slowly from town to town, so that as late as 1520 or 1530 we are still in the region of what would elsewhere be technically termed 'Early printed books'.

¹ One of these is of importance as putting back the date of the beginning of Brocar's Press at Logrono by five months to 18 November 1502.

COLARD MANSION

By SEYMOUR DE RICCI¹

COLARD MANSION, the first printer of Bruges, as the subject of an *Illustrated Monograph*, is peculiarly tempting to the bibliographer. The inducements are manifold. The life of Colard Mansion has only once been written, in 1829, by Van Praet, whose book is now both obsolete and scarce. Much has been discovered since about the man himself, the printer, and the artist. On the other hand, not too much is known for the subject to be exhaustively treated in a volume of a reasonable size.

First of all, there are new elements in Mansion's biography, such as documents relating to his flight from Bruges in 1484. Better still, the City Librarian at Amiens thinks he can establish that Mansion came to France. If so, what did he do there?

Secondly, if we study Mansion as a writer of manuscripts, the lost *Pénitence d'Adam*, until recently only known by an eighteenth-century bookseller's catalogue, has been rediscovered in the Bute collection.

Thirdly, we have now good miniatures from Mansion's workshop in a printed *Boetius* at Cambridge, and in a printed *Boccaccio* at Los Angeles.

Fourthly, three or four impressions of Mansion have turned up since the days of Van Praet, the most important being the *Estrif de Fortune*, of which copies are at Glasgow in the *Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève* and in the James de Rothschild collection.

Impressions already known have been more closely examined and new copies found. Variations between the few known copies have been noticed. Untraced copies have been located. In all some twenty-five impressions are now known, in some

¹ Abstract of a paper read before the Bibliographical Society on 22 March.

eighty extant copies, over twenty of which are in the Bibliothèque nationale.

Fifthly, Van Praet knew nothing of Colard Mansion as a publisher of illustrated books: his *Boccaccio* of 1476, with its nine engravings on copper, was only discovered about 1876 by David Laing in the Marquess of Lothian's library. This copy is not unique as most bibliographers believe: similar illustrated copies exist at Göttingen and at Amiens; stray proofs of the prints exist in various collections.

Sixthly, the whole problem of Caxton's relations with Colard Mansion requires to be restated, with a careful sifting of the evidence. Was he Caxton's teacher, as Blades used to think, or was he Caxton's pupil? Did he or did Caxton print the French *Recueil* in Caxton's type 1 and the *Quatre dernières choses* in Caxton's type 2? Who printed the *Proesses de Jason* and the *Méditations* on the seven penitential Psalms, both in Caxton's type 1? Is the unique frontispiece to the Devonshire-Huntington copy of the *Recuyell* from Mansion's workshop, or is it a later insertion?

Seventhly, what did Colard Mansion do after he left Bruges? What were his connexions with Abbeville? Did he have anything to do with the printing in that city, in 1486-7, of three handsome books, one of which was a reprint of his *Somme le Rural*?

Lastly, what became of his type and blocks? Through what channels did at least one of the latter come into the hands of Antoine Verard as recently ascertained by Mr. Edouard Rahir?

It would be quite unreasonable to expect final answers on all of the above questions. But it seems quite feasible and highly desirable to condense in a volume all the available evidence on these problems, with adequate reproductions of the types, the illustrations and the miniatures. If I am not much mistaken, a volume of that character would correspond in many ways to the requirements of an Illustrated Monograph of the Bibliographical Society.

the

as
with
out
ry.
ve :
ns ;

with
ing
to
on
tre
the
cial
ece
om

es?
y-
ree
al?
at
of
r ?
on
nd
ble
of
ot
nd
ph



ALEXANDER POPE

By W. HOARE



r

m

'

'

'

'

'

'

fa

of

au

to

ex

in

a

in

th

an

H

as

'

'

'

'

'

B

th

A PORTRAIT OF ALEXANDER POPE

BY RAYMOND CRAWFURD, M.D. OXON., F.R.C.P.

THERE has recently come into my possession, along with other relics of Alexander Pope, a portrait of the poet in red chalk, which is here reproduced. On the lower margin of the drawing is the following inscription: 'This is the only portrait that was ever drawn of Mr. Pope at full length and was done without his knowledge, as he was deeply engaged in conversation with Mr. Allen, in the Gallery of Prior Park, by Mr. Hoare, who sat at the other end of the Gallery.' This portrait has been in the possession of my family certainly for more than a hundred years, and as some of them were on friendly terms with Pope, I assumed its authenticity. In an unguarded moment I showed the drawing to Sir John MacAlister, and by some hypnotic process he extracted from me a promise to reproduce it with a description in his pet publication, *The Library*. This has necessitated a certain amount of casual investigation, which has been instructive to myself, and may be so to some others.

My first discovery was that this identical drawing formed the frontispiece to Warton's edition of Pope's Works (1797), and there it is described as a facsimile of a drawing by William Hoare, engraved by P. Condé. It carries the same inscription as mine, but with the following addition, 'Pope would never have forgiven the Painter had he known it—He was too sensible of the Deformities of his Person to allow the whole of it to be represented—This Drawing is therefore exceedingly valuable, as it is a Unique of this celebrated Poet'. Between my drawing and the engraving in Warton's book there is a minute, but suspicious, difference, in that the

uplifted right hand in the latter has the appearance of having a thumb and five fingers. We have so much information of Pope's personal peculiarities, that we may be sure no such deformity existed, and doubt arises as to whether the engraving was made from my portrait. If it was not, then my drawing is probably a copy of the original, and it would be interesting to know if that original still exists, and, if so, where.

The portrait is from the hand of William Hoare, R.A., who also was a friend of my family: his life extended from 1707 to 1792, and he is often spoken of as Hoare of Bath, because there it was chiefly that he lived and produced most of his work. He painted many of the distinguished people, who went to Bath for the cure, and Pope, when he was a guest of Ralph Allen, the 'Man of Bath', at Prior Park. Beside this chalk drawing there is a half-length painting of Pope by William Hoare in the National Portrait Gallery.

We can fix the date of the drawing with some precision, for Allen did not commence the building of Prior Park till 1736, and it was not completed till 1742, and Pope died on May 30, 1744. The house can hardly have been sufficiently advanced for Allen to entertain a company of guests till 1738, if then. Pope is known to have been at Prior Park in the late autumn of 1742, and again in 1743, when the famous Allen-Blount-Pope quarrel occurred. Most likely the drawing was made in either 1742 or 1743, and probability is on the side of the former year.

The statement that Pope 'was too sensible of the Deformities of his Person to allow the whole of it to be represented' requires some qualification, for there are in existence more than one portrait of the full figure seated: clearly it is meant to apply only to full-length portraits of the standing figure. Peter Cunningham, in his edition of Johnson's *Lives of the Poets* (1854), gives a list of the numerous known portraits of Pope, and mentions one at full length in the possession of

Lord Lansdowne at Bowood. He is mistaken, for this portrait, now at Lansdowne House, represents Pope as sitting, with the right elbow resting on a table, and the head leaning on the right hand, and it is but three-quarter length.

Since such a large number of portraits are in existence (for Cunningham mentions nineteen and that probably does not exhaust the list), and no standing full-length portrait, taken with Pope's consent, is forthcoming, we may give credence to the tradition that Pope's sensitiveness as to his physical defects caused him persistently to decline the pose.

A good deal of information as to Pope's physical characteristics is available from various sources. For better or for worse, he was, according to Joshua Reynolds, but 4 feet 6 inches high: when seated at the dinner table, he required, like a child, a specially raised seat to enable him to compete on equal terms with his neighbours. The shortness was of the trunk, for he is said to have had long arms and legs, which made him resemble a spider, and, when his arms were in active movement, a miniature windmill. The shortness was clearly the outcome of disease, for Reynolds says that he was very hunch-backed and deformed: presumably the hunch-back was due to angular curvature from tubercular disease of the spine, for his father was similarly afflicted; but there would seem to have been some rotation of the vertebrae as well, for we are told that one side of his chest was contracted. The spinal trouble was in full evidence at the age of 17, and is said to have started when he was twelve years old.

John Dennis, pursuing the amenities of the age, called him a pigmy animal and a hunch-backed toad, and Pope in a Letter to a Noble Lord says 'It is true, my lord, I am short, not 'well-shaped, sometimes dirty': while Warton describes him as protuberant behind and before.

Johnson, in his *Life of Pope*, gives a summary of a communication to the *Gentleman's Magazine*, in its issue of

September 1775 : he says 'Most of what can be told concerning his petty peculiarities was communicated by a female domestick of the Earl of Oxford, who knew him perhaps after the middle of life. He was then so weak as to stand in perpetual need of female attendance : extremely sensible of cold so that he wore a fur doublet under a shirt of very coarse warm linen with sleeves. When he rose he was invested in a boddice made of stiff canvass, being scarce able to hold himself erect till they were laced, and he then put on a flannel waistcoat. One side was contracted. His legs were so slender that he enlarged their bulk with three pairs of stockings, which were drawn on and off by the maid : for he was not able to undress himself, and neither went to bed nor rose without help. His weakness made it very difficult for him to be clean'. Hawkins, in his 1787 edition of Johnson's Works, describes this bodice as 'stays', on the assurance of a Twickenham waterman, who had often felt them when lifting Pope into a boat. This buckram bodice was, of course, the precursor of the modern poroplastic jacket, worn by subjects of spinal caries.

Reynolds, in his description of Pope from a chance meeting of a few minutes when a boy, records an observation which I have failed so far to substantiate. He says 'his mouth had those peculiar marks which are always found in the mouths of crooked persons, and the muscles were so strongly marked as to appear like small cords'. Several of the portraits show these muscular bands running downwards and forwards from mid-cheek to the lower jaw, which is unusually long, as is not uncommon in the tilted heads of hunch-backs ; but I can find no traces of the circumoral lines, nor does my own experience nor that of artists and medical men assure me of their occurrence in hunch-backs. Mr. H. A. T. Fairbank, in a wide orthopaedic experience, has seen nothing of them, but has suggested to me that Reynolds may have had in mind the

linear markings of congenital syphilis. His suggestion inevitably recalled two lines of the *Essay on Man*,

‘As that the virtuous son is ill at ease,
When his lewd father gave the dire disease.’

Curiously these lines occur immediately after he has made allusion to his own other parent. But we need not pursue the question, as there is no corroborative evidence, and syphilis of the spine is so rare as to rule out the supposition that the spinal disease of father and son was of that nature. Linear markings about the mouth are seen as indications of prolonged sickness and suffering, such as must have attended spinal caries before the introduction of the most modern methods, and we may reasonably assume that such was their origin in the case of Pope.

Roubiliac, who made a bust of Pope, said that he would have known from the furrows above the eyebrows that Pope was a man who had suffered much from headaches: such was the case, and he is said to have inherited the tendency, which declared itself in boyhood, from his mother: inhalation of the steam of boiling coffee was Pope's palliative for these headaches.

'THE EARLY PRINTERS AND BOOKSELLERS OF WINCHESTER

BY A. CECIL PIPER, CITY LIBRARIAN, WINCHESTER

THE following notes, dealing with the printers and booksellers of Winchester up to the year 1800, are based principally upon my researches among the local archives of the City, now housed in the Winchester Public Library. The history of the book trade in Winchester is an interesting phase of its history, about which very little has been written; although there is sufficient material for the compilation of a bibliographical history of Winchester, especially when we remember the famous school of illumination carried on in the scriptorium of the Cathedral Church during the time of Æthelwold. There was also a considerable bookbinding industry, Winchester bindings being well known for their good workmanship. But this phase of my subject is outside the limits of the present article. In my previous notes on 'The Book Trade in Winchester', published in *The Library*, 3rd Series, vol. vii, 1916, pp. 191-7, full extracts are printed from the City Archives relating to a number of the early Winchester printers and booksellers.

PRINTERS

Cotton, in his *Typographical Gazetteer*, mentions that in 1545 there was published a violent attack on Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester at that time. It bears the title *The Rescuynge of the Romische Fox; otherwyse called, The Examination of the Hunter, deuised by Steven Gardiner*, and was written by William Turner under the pseudonym of William Wraghton. A colophon at the end reads 'Imprynted have at Winchester,

'anno domini 1545, 4 nonas Martii. By me Hanse Hit prik'. It is now quite certain that this book was not printed at Winchester at all, and it is very doubtful if it was even printed in England. Most probably it was printed on the continent, possibly in Switzerland or Holland.

I can find no trace of a printing press having been established in Winchester before the end of the seventeenth century. The earliest date I have found is 1691, the following entry occurring under that year in the local records :

'Printing the Ordinances £3. 5. 6.'

but no printer's name is given. It is very probable that there was a printer at work in the City at this time, and that these City Ordinances were printed here ; but there is no definite proof of this.

The late Alderman W. H. Jacob, a local antiquary of some note, says that James Ayres was at work in 1720, but I have been unable to verify this. The earliest date I can find any mention of this printer is 1751, and the latest 1758, various entries in the local archives, such as charges for printing done for the Council, indentures, &c., occurring between these dates. There are two books printed by James Ayres, but both are undated, viz. *Poems on several occasions, English and Latin*, by J. D. Cotton, and a *Sermon on St. Peter's Repentance*. Both Alderman Jacob, and F. A. Edwards in his paper on 'Early Hampshire printers', published in the *Hampshire Field Club Proceedings*, vol. ii, 1890-3, ascribe these volumes to 1720 or thereabouts, but I think this is open to dispute.

According to Negus's *List of Printing-houses*, there were two presses at work in Hampshire in 1724, one at Gosport and the other in Winchester. There appears to be no record of the name of the Winchester printer of this date.

In 1725 Isaac James Philpott, or Philpot, began printing, as in the 'Ninth Book of Ordinances' of the City is the following interesting record :

'14th August, 1725. Agreed and ordered at and by the same Assembly, that Isaac James Philpott shall be permitted and allowed to use the Trades of a Printer and Bookseller within this City paying for a Fyne or Composition for such permission One pound one shilling, he being not qualified by any means to use the said Trades without such Composition or allowance within this City.'

On 20 December 1732 we find that Philpott was allowed £25 from Sir Thomas White's bequest to the City for assisting deserving tradesmen. Philpott also had a bookbinder's business in addition to his printing and bookselling business. The earliest book printed in Winchester that I can trace was printed by Philpott :

'Budworth (W.). A sermon preached at the Parish Church of All Saints in Southampton, Monday, January xxxi, 1731-2. Winton: printed by Isaac Philpot in the High-street, MDCCXXXII.'

Isaac James Philpott was, in all probability, a relative of James Philpot, who was a printer at Gosport in 1710. There are a number of entries in the local records showing items that Philpott printed for the City Council with the cost of printing. He died before 1779, as a lease dated 23 August 1779, was granted to

'Mary Philpott, widow, relict and sole executrix of Isaac James Philpott'.

The next printer working in the City appears to be William Ayres, as in the 'Mayor's Accounts' for 1742 and 1744 are two receipted bills for printing done by him. He was probably a son, or other relative, of the James Ayres mentioned above.

Between 1760 and 1802 John Burdon was at work, either as a printer or bookseller, or both. His name appears in the imprint of Warton's *Description of the City, College, and Cathedral of Winchester*, printed in London about 1760. In 1778 he issued *Selectæ Historiæ ex C. J. Casare, Justino,*

L. A. Floro et C. Suetonio Tranquillo, in usum Scholæ Wintoniensis. Impensis J. Burdon, Winton, MDCCLXXVIII. Timperley says that Burdon was 'a very respectable bookseller at Winchester'.

In 1762 another member of the Ayres family, Henry, was printing, who, in June of that year, issued an *Account of days and hours when the posts arrive at and depart from the City of Winchester*. The imprint reads—'Printed by Henry Ayres 'and sold by J. Austen, clerk to the post office'.

A bookseller named Grenvill was in business in 1722, as there is extant a statement of accounts dated 1722-3, which mentions him. Between 1756 and 1781 we find a bookseller of the name of William Greenville, who later added a printing press to his business. He was probably the son of the above-named Grenvill, although it is just possible they may be one and the same; yet it is hardly likely, as he would have been a very old man by 1780. There is also a record of William Greenville having served the office of Low and High Bailiff in 1780-1. The only book I can trace printed by Greenville is an edition of Warton's *Description of Winchester*, which bears his imprint, and was published about 1780. In 1766 Greenville was granted one of the loans of £25 from Sir Thomas White's bequest.

In 1766 John Meaisey had a press, as there are several bills preserved in the local archives relating to work done for the City Council.

The next printer at work is John Wilkes, who also had a press in London, and was proprietor of the 'Encyclopaedia Londinensis'. The earliest date I can trace that he was at work in Winchester is 1772, when a lease of the premises formerly occupied by James Ayres in the High Street was granted to him. John Wilkes was a Freeman of the City, and the first Winchester proprietor of the *Hampshire Chronicle* which started at Southampton in 1772, and was shortly afterwards produced at Winchester, Wilkes printing it from 1778 to

1784. He lived in the parish of St. Lawrence, and was buried in that church in 1810. There is a stone in the same church to the memory of his wife, with the following inscription :

'Here lyeth Rebecca, the wife of John Wilkes, of this City, who departed this life the 22nd May, 1782, age 32.' There are several bills for printing executed by Wilkes for the City Council, dated 1773-4 and 1778-80, preserved among our local records. Wilkes printed, in 1773, *The History and Antiquities of Winchester*, in two volumes, with illustrations drawn by W. Cave, also of Winchester. This is the earliest production from his press I can find.

John Sadler was in business as a printer and bookseller, in the High Street, in 1782, as we find him so described in a legal document of that date. The earliest book he published appears to be Jane Cave's *Poems*, which he printed for the author in 1783. Sadler also printed and published the earliest known Hampshire directory in 1784, the preface of which was dated from Winchester, March 2, 1784.

Thomas Blagden is the next printer we find, and he, apparently, worked between 1784 and 1796. On a poster dated 10 May 1784, the imprint reads—'Winchester : Printed by T. Blagden, successor to J. Wilkes'. He also printed the *Hampshire Chronicle* from 1784 to 1791, and published *The Winchester Guide* in 1796. Thomas Blagden married, on 9 May 1790, a daughter of the Rev. William Hawkins, Vicar of Boldre and Lymington, Hampshire.

In 1785 was published *An Essay on Redemption*, by J. Balguy, second edition, Winchester : printed for Lockyer Davis, printer to the Royal Society. I cannot find any record of Davis having a press at Winchester. It may have been printed by a Winchester printer for Davis, or it may have been printed in London.

In 1786 James Robbins was a printer and bookseller. The earliest work he printed appears to be a sermon by James

Chelsum, printed in 1788. But his chief work was Milner's *History of Winchester*, in two volumes, 1798-1801. He printed a number of other works during the succeeding years, and his press was at work down to between 1820 and 1830. About 1829 he entered into partnership with Charles Henry Wheeler.

J. S. Adler was at work in 1787, as a form is extant, 'Return of Prices of Corn', which states that it was 'Printed by J. S. Adler, High Street', and is dated 13 January 1787.

In the 'Hampshire County Club Minute Book', under date 18 March 1790, is a list of bills to be paid, among the items being 'Collins, printer, £5. 13. 0.'

I can find no record of this printer; it is quite possible this item may refer to the Salisbury printer of that name, and not to a Winchester tradesman at all.

In the *Universal British Directory* for 1792 we find Robert Allen, Moses [or Moss] Dimmock, and Benjamin Long mentioned as printers and booksellers; while Joseph Bucknall printed the *Hampshire Chronicle* in 1795-6.

BOOKSELLERS

The earliest bookseller I have been able to trace is William Taylor, who was in business in 1663, as the imprint of a book published in London in that year, entitled *Look unto Jesus*, by 'Edward Lane, Vicar of Sparshatt, in the County of South, alias Hampshire', states that it was 'sold in Winchester by William Taylor, near the Chequer Gate'.

In St. Peter Chesil *Churchwardens' Accounts* for 1666 is the following entry:

'Paid to Thomas Heyd for a neue bocke 2. 6.'

Thomas Heyd may be identical with the 'Mr. Heade', from whom the Town Clerk of Winchester purchased parchment in 1658. [See my article on 'Parchment makers of Winchester', in *Library*, 3rd Series, vol. x, p. 67.] If so, he is the earliest bookseller recorded in the City.

In the 'Fifth Ledger Book', on 16 September 1668, is the record of a lease granted to a victualler in the City, of 'a tenement . . . neare the Market Howse . . . extending 'from the way leadinge to the Cathedrall Church . . . and 'hath on the east the Market Howse and on the west the 'dwelling house of Humfry Bowry, Bookseller'.

From 1682 onwards we find the name of William Clark or Clarke, bookseller, occurring on title-pages, while in the Corporation accounts under date 10 December 1703 there is an entry :

'Pd. Mr. Clark for a book for the Council House 9. o.' This bookseller died before 1734, as an Ordinance, dated 16 April 1734, states :

'That—Clarke, widow of William Clarke, heretofore of 'this City, bookseller, decd., shall have the Marks in the 'room of Widow Walker, decd.'

William Colson was a bookseller during the first half of the eighteenth century, as another quaintly worded Ordinance, dated 13 March 1741, reads :

'That William Colson, of this City, Bookseller, an Aged 'man and a person who heretofore lived in good repute '(tho' now gone to decay) shall be put an Almsman in 'Christ's Hospitall.'

In 1746 there was a bookseller of the name of Prior, who sold the *Winchester Journal, or, Weekly Review*, established in 1743, which, however, was printed at Reading, but afterwards printed at Winchester.

In addition to those booksellers who were also printers, and who have been dealt with above as printers, a Samuel Maunder was a bookseller in this city in 1791.

Appended is a chronological list of Winchester printers (to 1850) and booksellers (to 1800) so far as I can trace them.

110 *Early Printers and Booksellers of Winchester*

PRINTERS

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1691 ? | c. 1800 — Bucknill. |
| ? 1720 James Ayres. | 1813 William Jacob and
William Johnson. |
| 1724 ? | 1828 Charles Henry
Wheeler. |
| 1725 Isaac James Philpott. | 1829 James Robbins and
Charles Henry
Wheeler. |
| 1742 William Ayres. | 1833 Jacob Jacob. |
| 1760 John Burdon. | 1835 N. Warren. |
| 1762 Henry Ayres. | 1838 D. E. Gilmour.
Henry Moody. |
| 1766 John Meaisey. | 1842 H. Wooldridge. |
| 1772 John Wilkes. | 1847 W. Tanner. |
| 1780 William Greenville. | 1848 H. W. Cropp.
G. and H. Gilmour.
W. Hart.
R. Moody. |
| 1782 John Sadler. | 1850 John Fry.
William Savage. |
| 1784 Thomas Blagden. | |
| 1785 Lockyer Davis (?). | |
| 1786 James Robbins. | |
| 1787 J. S. Adler. | |
| 1792 Robert Allen.
Moses [or Moss] Dim-
mock.
Benjamin Long. | |
| 1795 Joseph Bucknall. | |
| 1799 William Jacob. | |

BOOKSELLERS

- | | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| 1658 Thomas Heyd or
Heade. | 1746 — Prior. |
| 1663 William Taylor. | 1756 William Greenville. |
| 1682 William Clark or
Clarke. | 1760 John Burdon. |
| 1687 Humfry Bowry. | 1782 John Sadler. |
| c. 1700-40 William Colson. | 1786 James Robbins. |
| 1722 — Grenvill. | 1791 Samuel Maunder. |
| 1725 Isaac James Phil-
pott. | 1792 Robert Allen.
Moses [or Moss] Dim-
mock.
Benjamin Long. |

THE DIVISION OF RARE ENGLISH BOOKS BETWEEN ENGLAND AND THE UNITED STATES¹

WITHIN the past twelvemonths the completion of the sale of the Huth Library, the progress made in dispersing the treasures of the Christie Miller collection and the sale of the Mostyn plays have carried to a climax the absorption by American collectors of most of the rarer early books of English literature which were still in private ownership in England. The process has been going on ever since I have had anything to do with books, and I think probably began in the seventies of the last century. Certainly in 1886, when I had a hand in the preparation for press of Mr. Frederick Locker's catalogue of his 'Rowfant Books', it must have been going on for some years, for contrary to the expectation not only of Mr. Locker himself, but of Bernard Quaritch, who published the catalogue, the entire impression sold out immediately, and the orders for it came mainly from the United States. Mr. Locker was one of the very few collectors who have treated book buying as a fine art. He aimed at bringing together a representative collection of the best English imaginative literature, as far as possible in the first editions of each book, and by knowledge and good taste gave his gatherings a real artistic unity. Long before his catalogue was printed the bibliophiles of New York had found him out and taken his cabinet of small books as a model especially appropriate to an English-speaking collector. Before they bought his catalogue they

¹ In writing this paper I have made free use of portions of articles on the Export of Rare Books to America, contributed in December 1919 and January 1920 to the *Observer*, the courtesy of whose Editor in allowing me to do so I very gratefully acknowledge.

had already been buying books of the same class as those he loved, and they have been buying them busily ever since, at first on a small scale, latterly, whenever occasion has offered, by sweeping the board practically clean. The history of the movement ought surely to be written, and whoever writes it I hope that Mr. Beverly Chew will be persuaded to contribute an introduction, as no one else can know so much about the movement or has had a larger share in guiding it to worthy ends.

Whenever that history comes to be written I believe that it will be recorded that the transference of our English literary rarities has been on a much larger scale in the case of the books printed after 1660 than of the earlier and more highly priced books about which we have lately heard so much. The transference of these has indeed been very considerable. Half a century ago the modest collection of Thomas P. Barton, a batch of Shakespeariana which James Lenox had bought for £600, and nine plays (since destroyed by fire) in the University of Virginia were nearly the only Shakespeare quartos in the United States. Curiously enough, these are still almost the only Shakespeare quartos in public ownership in the States, as I presume the Elizabethan Club at Yale is a private body; but the number in private hands is so great that there are now more of these quartos on the other side of the Atlantic than on this. Of course, there is always a chance of a dozen or more plays, preserved from destruction by being bound together in a fat volume, turning up in some English country house, but I only know of one considerable batch still remaining in private ownership in England. Fortunately, there are good sets at the British Museum, at the Bodleian Library, and at Trinity College, Cambridge, and minor ones elsewhere; but the privately owned copies are nearly all gone. As regards the Shakespeare folios I believe that not only are there more of them now

in the United States than in England, but that it is only in one or more American libraries that copies of the later folios bearing all the possible varieties of imprints can be seen in juxtaposition, and complete proof be thus obtained that these varieties of imprint do not carry with them any textual significance. No institution on either side of the water could now afford to buy the requisite number of copies of such expensive books merely to demonstrate this (it was not without some searchings of conscience that the British Museum a few years ago completed its set of copies of the first edition of *Paradise Lost* with all the variant title-pages that can be proved to exist); but it is a good thing to have it demonstrated somewhere, and the private collector who undertakes such a burden, be he English or American, deserves the praise of bibliographers. In the same way, while the British Museum is well content with its four First Folios and only regrets that Mr. Grenville did not leave his in the original binding, the existence of a much greater number of copies in Mr. Folger's ownership (I wish I could say 'in his library') offers a promise of future possibilities of a really exhaustive collation which is all to the good. The fact remains that within a comparatively few years American collectors have brought together materials for the study of Shakespeare's text which fully equal and perhaps slightly surpass those in British ownership. It is a very fine achievement, and one which every wise Englishman will view not merely without jealousy, but with the greatest possible pleasure that they have thought it worth accomplishing, and have accomplished it.

The only valid ground for resenting the American absorption of so large a proportion of the rare books which till lately remained in private ownership in England would be a demonstration that the total stock is too small to bear division, and that thus every book which goes to the United

114 *The Division of Rare English Books between*

States is a loss to English scholarship. As regards unique books there is a real difficulty, because bibliographical study is greatly facilitated by all the books of a series being available for comparison under a single roof; but even the loss of a unique book is not irreparable if a facsimile can be obtained in its place, and of most old books enough copies have survived to make division quite harmless. It is absurd to suggest that England is being denuded of its rarest early books, when the plain fact is that by the time the American purchases began the larger half of the important books, thanks to the generosity of a succession of benefactors, had already passed into the great English libraries.

As a printed bookman, a student of the younger branch of bibliography, I have no special knowledge of manuscripts. But it is notorious that, save for the collections formed by William Morris and Richard Bennett, purchased by Mr. J. P. Morgan, and his own valuable additions to these, and for some recently acquired by Mr. Huntington, there are very few important manuscripts in the United States. On the other hand, the wealth of both the British Museum and the Bodleian Library, both in English and French manuscripts, is very great, and behind these two sister libraries there stand the University Library and Fitzwilliam Museum at Cambridge, and also the College Libraries at Cambridge and Oxford, and the Cathedral libraries all over England. At the magnificent exhibition of illuminated manuscripts held at the Burlington Fine Arts Club in 1908, from which the larger libraries were bound by their statutes to hold aloof, the colleges and cathedrals contributed over a fifth of the exhibits, the rest being supplied by private owners. Despite the departure of the Morris and Bennett MSS., some of those of Mr. Huth (the best were claimed under the terms of his will for the British Museum), and now some of Mr. Yates Thompson's, it is probable that during the last thirty years more fine

manuscripts have entered England from abroad than have been exported, and the great bulk of the valuable manuscripts in the country are in public or semi-public ownership, from which they can only be wrested by force of arms. Here, at least, it is evident that the United States is suffering the fate of the late-comer, and can never rival the English collections.

When we turn from manuscripts to early printed books, the case is not more striking, but capable of more striking presentation, because we can call figures to our aid. In 1898, when Robert Proctor issued his 'Index to the Early Printed Books in the British Museum from the invention of printing to the year 1500, with notes of those in the Bodleian Library', he was able to register 9,841 different editions of this period in the two libraries with which he dealt. His book, which carried out on a great scale a scheme of Henry Bradshaw's, not only revolutionized the study of early printing, but gave a great impetus to collecting. In order to forward the work which Proctor began, the British Museum has purchased over twelve hundred of these 'fifteeners' since 1898, and the total in the two libraries now can hardly be much under 11,000. In the United States Mr. Morgan has a fine collection, and a book-lover of quite another stamp, General Rush C. Hawkins, the doyen of fifteenth-century men, who began buying in 1855, has given a finely chosen and finely arranged collection of books 'mostly from the presses of the first printers' to the Ann Mary Brown Memorial at Providence, R.I. There are also many medical fifteeners in the Surgeon-General's Library at Washington, and a nice collection formed by John Boyd Thacher at the Library of Congress. But a 'census' of these fifteenth-century books owned in the United States has lately been taken and most admirably edited by Mr. G. P. Winship, and the total number of different editions reported is 'more than 6,640', i.e. only about 60 per cent. of those in the British Museum and

Bodleian, and not much more than half the number that could be identified in public libraries in England, excluding all those in private ownership. Here again the United States is a late-comer.

Thanks to Mr. Morgan and Mr. Huntington, American bookmen have no excuse for ignorance of what was done in England in the fifteenth century. Mr. Morgan's collection of Caxtons is now about equal to that at the Cambridge University Library and ranks above the Bodleian, being only surpassed by the British Museum and the John Rylands Library, which was built up on the purchase of the Spencer books. With the aid of the Devonshire Caxtons Mr. Huntington's must now be nearly abreast of the Bodleian. Both libraries are so young that it may be thought that in a few more years they will catch up and pass the older collections, but in these matters it is not the first but the later steps that are difficult and expensive; to secure fifty Caxtons is very much more than twice as hard as to secure twenty-five. In the preface to his admirable bibliography of 'English Fifteenth Century Books', Mr. Gordon Duff tells us, 'roughly speaking, one half of the books here chronicled are now known only from single copies, from a leaf or two, or even from fragments of a leaf'. The great majority of these unique books and fragments are in the older libraries, from which they can never be removed, as is the case, for instance, with the wonderful little volume of poetical pieces in small quarto bequeathed by Bishop Moore to the Cambridge University Library. The British Museum, the Bodleian, and the John Rylands Library all have their unique Caxtons. So far as I know, the only one in the United States is the 'Cato' in Mr. Huntington's library, though Mr. Morgan's *Horæ*, with its 62 leaves printed on vellum against four on paper in the Bodleian, is entitled to a *proxime accessit*. Out of 99 books and documents known to have been printed by Caxton, the

British Museum possesses 58 and fragments of eleven others. It has 42 *De Wordes* printed before the close of 1500, 36 *Pynsons*, 24 *Lettons* and *Machlinias*, and 25 books for the English market printed abroad. In Oxford books it is beaten by both the Bodleian Library (as is just) and the Rylands, which have respectively eleven and ten against its eight. In St. Albans books it ties with Cambridge and the Rylands Library, with a total of four out of eight printed. Altogether the Museum has (besides duplicates) 200 copies and twenty fragments recorded by Mr. Duff, Rylands 139 (plus one fragment), Cambridge 124 (plus nine), Bodley 108 (plus 20). The four collections differ considerably in their contents, and their grand total of distinct editions cannot possibly be equalled by any combination of new collectors. Up to the present, unless I am mistaken, neither Mr. Morgan nor Mr. Huntingdon's English incunabula as a whole (despite their strength in *Caxtons*) approaches the Bodleian total.

When we turn from the fifteenth to the sixteenth century, or the extended period to the close of the year 1640, which is usually taken to mark the end of English 'early' books, the handicap of the late-starters is still heavy. In the few years he has been at work Mr. Huntingdon has got together a wonderfully fine collection of these books. It is less remarkable, however, for its quantity than its quality, as it certainly does not contain more than 4,000 different editions against some 16,000 in the British Museum, over 11,000 in the Bodleian, and over 8,000 at Cambridge. Here again the three great English collections are on markedly different lines, and must total between them over 20,000 different titles, excluding duplicates, and I shall be surprised if, when the 'Short-Title Catalogue of English Books printed before the close of 1640' is completed, the libraries in the United States add more than, at most, 500 new titles to these.

Up to the present the most serious assaults of American

buyers have aimed at the capture of Elizabethan plays. When Mr. W. W. Greg printed his 'Hand-list' of these in 1900 he recorded altogether (if I have counted rightly) 1,011 editions, or separate issues, of plays printed up to 1640. American competition for plays had then hardly begun. Twenty-four editions of which Mr. Greg found mention he could not trace; of the remaining 987 no fewer than 845 were in the British Museum, and 73 of those not in the Museum were in the Bodleian, and some thirty others in the Dyce collection at the Victoria and Albert Museum or the Capell collection at Trinity College, Cambridge. Between them the four libraries accounted for nearly 97 per cent. of the total number of these plays that could be traced in 1900. In the last twenty years most of the odd 3 per cent. have gone to the United States, mainly in the Devonshire collection, and perhaps another thirty editions, not known in 1900, which high prices have attracted to the market, have mostly gone there also.

As late as 1906 the British Museum was able to secure as many as seven of those in the little volume which an Irish owner is said to have sent to Messrs. Sotheby with a label pasted on its cover and no other wrapping, so lightly did he esteem its value. Since 1906 the Museum has acquired only about half-a-dozen others, one (it is a pleasure to note) as a gift from an American collector. The 97 per cent. of traceable plays formerly owned by English public libraries has sunk to about 95 per cent. But 95 per cent. is not a bad proportion, and here also, in the most hotly assailed section of our storehouse, it would seem that there is still no reason for English book-lovers to take alarm.

In connexion with the visit of American Professors of English to the British Museum in July a special exhibition of the Rarer Books of English Literature was arranged in the King's Library and has remained on view, under careful

observation, lest the poor paper on which many of the rarest books are printed should be injured by exposure to the (Bloomsbury) sunlight. The experience gained in arranging this exhibition has certainly strengthened my belief that down to about the death of Milton the Museum has very nearly all the books it ought to have, and has them as a rule in very fine copies, with only just enough conspicuous lacunae (Caxton's *Malory* being the chief) to curb any undue self-satisfaction. The Bodleian is also very rich, both libraries having benefitted largely from the gifts and bequests of great collectors, as it is to be hoped that American libraries will benefit in the near future. With such a wealth of editions available for the use of English students, it is surely easy to rejoice that our American fellow-workers, many of whom have made such notable contributions to research of late years, should also have adequate materials on which to work.

For the post-Restoration period I must confess I am somewhat less at my ease. The publication in 1883 of its special Catalogue of English Books printed up to 1640 has caused the British Museum to continue to make special efforts to enrich this collection ever since I have been on the staff. Mr. Proctor's 'Index' to our fifteenth-century books (published in 1898) has in like manner stimulated the purchase of incunabula. In the meanwhile the post-Restoration books (which even now fetch only small prices compared to the earlier ones, and so have been very attractive to collectors of moderate means) have been slipping over to the United States in a steady stream, and I am not at all confident that if figures could be worked out for this later period the Museum would make, even in numbers, as brave a show as I could wish. Certainly in point of condition, always a difficulty in the Dryden and Pope period, its copies often leave much to be desired, for the quite legitimate but regrettable reason that they have not been bought by great collectors,

but by a library for students, founded not so many years after Pope died, and which has thus acquired most of its eighteenth-century books as working copies without any particular thought for what we now call their 'exhibition value'. A private collector would, of course, have long ago sold the working copies and bought better ones; but it is not easy for a library with many calls on its funds to imitate the magnificences of the private collector, and the showcases devoted to the period 1660-1780 have certainly given me less pleasure than any others in the special exhibition. After 1780 there is a distinct improvement for some years, with a specially excellent show of Shelleys, partly due to the enthusiasm of Dr. Garnett. The exhibition comes to an end at 1830, from which date onwards the Museum depends very largely on the copies received under the Copyright Acts, which before their writers become famous naturally see much hard service in the Reading Room. The other great English libraries must be much in the same condition, and it is thus in the more modern books, the exportation of which has had no spectacular features and therefore attracted very little attention, that it is most difficult to view the transference of English books to the United States with entire equanimity.

ALFRED W. POLLARD.

OLD ENGLISH POETICAL ARCHETYPES

DR. GREG'S review of my pamphlet (see *The Library*, June 1920, pp. 58-61) is highly gratifying to me. I am glad to find that a critic so peculiarly qualified to judge in such a matter is able to accept my proof that many Old English poems were copied from manuscripts written on loose sheets uniform in quantity of writing, and regularly ending with the conclusion of a sentence and a verse. That he should refuse to follow me in the conclusion that these curious phenomena indicate the method of composition of the Old English poets does not surprise me. This conclusion would admittedly be improbable apart from the positive evidence in its favour. But I must continue to regard it as established, unless some other way can be found of completely accounting for the facts; and it does not appear that Dr. Greg has done this even to his own satisfaction. His criticism of the table on p. 8 is certainly justified; and he is probably right in objecting to my suggested explanation of the position of the X in the margin of the manuscript. (This explanation, however, was proposed only as the less likely of two alternatives.)

My purpose in the present writing, however, is not to comment on the review, but to confess and rectify a mistake of my own which my critic has not pointed out. In the Old English paraphrase of Genesis, the story of the creation of Eve (Gen. ii. 21-2) comes before the account of Paradise and its rivers (Gen. ii. 8-14). I erroneously assumed that this inversion of the Bible order was due to a dislocation in the text of the paraphrase, and suggested that two leaves of the extant manuscript had changed places when the

volume was being repaired. Further consideration has convinced me that the transposition is due to the difficulties which the paraphrast found in dealing with the duplicate accounts of the creation in the first two chapters of the Bible. When he came to the words 'masculum et feminam creavit eos' in Gen. i. 27, he felt that he could not leave this summary statement without amplification. He therefore imported the account of the making of woman from the second chapter, but after this returned to the original sequence. The supposed dislocation in the text of the paraphrase is therefore non-existent, so that I need not dispute with Dr. Greg as to the likeliest way of accounting for it.

I may here mention that Professor Craigie has pointed out to me that I was wrong in regarding the 'Daniel' poem as an insoluble exception to my theory of the origin of the numbered sections. When due allowance is made for the insertion of the 'Azarias' from another manuscript, the figures work out correctly.

HENRY BRADLEY.

REVIEW

BOOKS IN MANUSCRIPT¹

As the first edition of this work, which appeared so long ago as 1893, has now been revised and corrected by the author, it seems permissible to give some account of its contents for the benefit of a fresh generation of readers. It differs in some respects from other books on the subject. Writers of treatises on palaeography have generally addressed themselves to the student who desired to become an expert, and is prepared to swallow the bitter pill of knowledge uncoated by sugar in the shape of literary presentment. The graces of style therefore did not concern them. Mr. Madan has also taken into consideration a much neglected class of men, who, though scanty in numbers, are not to be despised, viz. amateurs, who make a hobby of collecting manuscripts and wish to gain knowledge which will enable them to appreciate their treasures. He thus caters not only for the poor student, but also for Maecenas himself. He has, therefore, written a book which treats the subject in a somewhat unconventional manner. Its most striking characteristics are lucidity of exposition and studied simplicity; while from time to time, as the writer warms to his subject, as notably in his description of illuminations, he becomes eloquent. Further, there is an undercurrent of humour which prevents the reader's interest from flagging: sometimes indeed Mr. Madan jokes. In short, though an expert, he is a stylist, and has produced a 'Palaeography without Tears'.

The work consists of eleven chapters, the first of which is introductory. Chap. ii deals with materials for writing

¹ *Books in Manuscript*. F. Madan. Second edition, revised (Kegan Paul, 1920).

and forms of books. Apart from ordinary information, such as appears in all works upon the subject, it contains some interesting details about the introduction of paper into Europe and the date of watermarks, while the origin of the terms folio, quarto, octavo, &c. is explained in the writer's most lucid style. Chap. iii discusses the history of writing from the earliest period until our own day. The reader cannot fail to be interested by Mr. Madan's example of a modern ideogram, viz. the printer's symbol of a hand with outstretched finger to direct attention, which he terms 'a pictorial symbol, saying as clearly as in words, Look there'. The changes which letters have undergone in the course of history are exemplified by the different forms of *D* and *M*. The rest of the chapter deals with the development of the national hands during the Dark Ages and the Renaissance in the eighth century under Charlemagne, to which we owe the great gift of the Carolingian minuscule; also, with the systems of abbreviation by suspension and contraction, as enunciated by Traube. Chap. iv informs us about scribes and their ways. The account of a mediaeval scriptorium is very vivid. The scribe was not allowed to talk but had to signify his wants by signs. 'If a scribe needed a book, he extended his hands and made a movement as of turning over leaves. If it was a missal that was wanted, he superadded the sign of a cross; if a psalter, he placed his hands on his head in the shape of a crown (a reference to King David); if a lectionary, he pretended to wipe away the grease (which might easily have fallen on it from a candle); if a small work was needed, not a Bible or service-book, but some inferior tractate, he placed one hand on his stomach and the other before his mouth. Finally, if a pagan work was required, he first gave the general sign, and then scratched his ear in the manner of a dog.' Among documents cited in this chapter special interest attaches to one furnished by the Paston Letters,

showing the sum paid under various items to a scribe at Bury St. Edmunds in 1467 for producing a Psalter. A selection is given from the colophons in which scribes expressed their feelings when their work was over. They seem to have been thirsty souls with a great craving for wine. Chap. v deals with illuminations, a subject dear to the writer. He refers to the delicately painted miniatures portraying some scene from the artist's own experience—'a market-place, it may be, with a housewife and loom within a doorway, a blacksmith at his forge and the neighbours chaffering and bargaining in the open square, above which tower the town hall and cathedral of his native town; or some banquet at the court of Burgundy in the fifteenth century, with its parade of magnificence, the gorgeous hangings and crowds of long-slippered pages' (space alone prevents me from continuing the quotation). The methods employed by the illuminators in different countries are described with great learning, although with great clearness and simplicity. Chap. vi is concerned with the errors of scribes, a vast subject which is illustrated from the manuscripts of Virgil. Among the 'curiosities of palaeography' cited at the end of this chapter may be mentioned a passage in the *Te Deum*, where 'Make them to be numbered with Thy Saints in glory everlasting' is due to misreading the Latin *munerari* as *numerari*. A still more singular error is in Zech. xi. 17 where the A. V. gives, 'Woe to the idol shepherd', a misprint for 'idle', which has survived in all its reproductions.

Chap. vii is devoted to 'Famous Libraries'. It contains an interesting description of the library at Titchfield Abbey in A.D. 1400, taken from the Latin register. Mr. Madan writes for English readers; otherwise, without doubt, he would have dwelt on the glories of Bobbio, Lorsch, and Cluny. For a similar reason when writing of modern libraries he deals fully with the British Museum and the

Bodleian, but passes briefly over the libraries of the Continent. Chap. viii deals with 'Famous MSS.'. The number of these is so many that it is only possible to give a very small selection: otherwise, as Mr. Madan remarks, his manual would be turned into a catalogue. He has, therefore, selected a few, nearly all within the British Isles. Among them figure works especially interesting to English students, such as Beowulf and Cædmon. The romantic story which belongs to so many manuscripts is well illustrated from the tale of St. Margaret's Gospel-Book.

Chap. ix tells us of literary forgeries. Among the examples referred to are the Letters of Phalaris, the False Decretals, the poems of Chatterton, the Ireland forgeries, the fictitious MS. of Uranius written in the last century by Simonides, and the Vrain-Lucas autographs. The last of these were very impudent fabrications. They included letters from a large number of famous persons, among them being one from Pontius Pilate to Tiberius, and one from Judas Iscariot to St. Mary Magdalene! Also, they were written in modern French on paper with a water-mark, frequently a *fleur-de-lys*! In spite of these suspicious circumstances they were bought for a large sum by a member of the French Academy.

The last two chapters will be of special use to collectors and amateurs generally. Chap. x deals with the treatment and cataloguing of manuscripts. It gives practical advice to some one who has just bought a manuscript at a sale, e.g. a missal, Book of Hours, or other liturgical work, to enable him to identify its contents, to determine its age, to find out if it is complete and in good condition, also to catalogue it. Chap. xi deals with public and private records, such as Domesday Book, Knights' Fees, Pipe Rolls, Deeds, Wills, Heraldic Visitations, and Court Rolls. The subject is intricate, but Mr. Madan's exposition is a model of clearness and he mingles amusement with instruction.

Custom demands that a reviewer should endeavour to pick a few holes, so I mention a few points to which exception may be made. On p. 28 Charlemagne appears to be spoken of as the originator of the Carolingian minuscule. Mr. Madan says that 'in the field of writing it has been granted to no one but him to influence profoundly the history of the alphabet'. The words of Einhard, the biographer of Charlemagne, seem to show that the King could barely write. He says (chap. xxv. 3): 'temptabat et scribere . . . sed parum successit labor praeposterus ac sero inchoatus.' The origin of this beautiful script is wrapped in mystery, since it does not exhibit insular characteristics, as would be expected from its connexion with Alcuin of York, Charlemagne's Minister of Education. On p. 84 Lucan is joined with Propertius as an example of an author whose text rests on few manuscripts. This seems a little odd, since editors enumerate some five manuscripts belonging to the ninth and tenth centuries, apart from fragments of fourth-century manuscripts. On p. 111 the Sinaiticus is said to be the oldest existing of all New Testament MSS. This may be so, but most writers make it a little later than the Vaticanus. On p. 126 the Verona *codex* of Sulpicius Severus, dated A.D. 517, is said to be the earliest dated vellum manuscript. The celebrated manuscript of Hilary belonging to the Chapter House of St. Peter in Rome has a colophon to the effect that it was written in A.D. 509-10, so it seems to possess priority. On p. 145 Mr. Madan discusses and rejects the strange theory of Ross and Hochart that the *Annals* of Tacitus were forged by Poggio. His words imply that it is only the first books, viz. i-vi, whose authenticity has been disputed. The doubts expressed by Ross and Hochart, however, extended also to the later books, xi-xvi, also. As the facts about the manuscripts of Tacitus are not very well known, I venture to state them. Each part of the *Annals* is known from one manuscript

only. Books i-vi are contained in the first Medicean, a manuscript written in the ninth century, probably in Germany; while xi-xvi are found in the second Medicean, a manuscript written in the eleventh century, probably at Monte Cassino. The first to come to light was Med. 2, which was known to Boccaccio as early as 1370, ten years before Poggio was born, and was apparently stolen by Boccaccio from Monte Cassino. Med. 1, as is shown by a letter of Pope Leo X, published by F. Philippi in *Philologus* XLV, p. 378, was brought to Italy from Corvey (Westphalia) in 1508, forty-nine years after the death of Poggio. It is, therefore, clear that neither part of the Annals could have been forged by Poggio.

ALBERT C. CLARK.